

SESSION #10
2018-02-05
FM2-125

Notes: Nisa and I reviewed constructions I created that Nisa checked with a woman from her community. Nisa and I reviewed the woman's judgments on these constructions, and Nisa also gave her judgments. Nisa's recording session with her occurred on December 23, 2017. These constructions are investigating the question of whether P, R, and T are equally accessible to syntactic operations (especially across AV and PV).

(13a) Siq=ne bèng kanak kembang siq dagang

-‘A seller gave a flower to a kid’

-(13b): “no way ... it’s not in the right order. Kembang is not a verb.” Nisa prefers when the verb immediately follows siq=ne

(13b) *Siq=ne kembang bèng kanak siq dagang

(14a) Siq=ne bèng kanak kembang siq dagang

-‘A seller gave a flower to a kid’

-again, as with (13b), (14b) is not good

(14b) *Siq=ne kanak bèng kembang siq dagang

(15a) Bèng=ne kanak kembang siq dagang

‘A seller gave a kid a flower’

(15a) is “basically OK”. (15b) “is not the first choice, not the main preference”, but it works if it has the right discourse situation

(15b) Kembang bèng=ne kanak siq dagang

(16a) Bèng=ne kanak kembang siq dagang

-same as with (15a-b), where (16b) is OK but not preferred and only works with right discourse context (both are okay, “equal” according to Nisa’s speaker)

(16b) Kanak bèng=ne kembang siq dagang

(17a) Siq=ku bèng dagang kèpèng

‘I gave a seller money’

-(17a) is OK but not (17b), where ‘seller’ is before the verb

(17b) Siq=ku dagang bèng kèpèng

(18a) Siq=ku bèng dagang kèpèng

-(18b) also does not work, for same reason as (17b)--“It always wants siq=ku bèng”, where verb is immediately after siq=ku

(18b) Siq=ku kèpèng bèng dagang

SECTION 2: Can P be extracted from both AV and PV?

- Try asking people which sentence in each pair they prefer better, or if they are both equally OK

(19a) Dengan no beli buku no

‘That guy bought that book’

-both feel the same

(19b) Siq=ne beli buku no (siq dengan no)

(20a) Né dengan [saq beli buku no]

‘This is the guy [who bought the book]’

(20b) *Né dengan saq=ne beli buku no

-Extracting A from AV in (20a). (20a) is preferred because “that clitic doesn’t make sense” in (20b). “It should be clitic-free”. This shows that Ampenan Sasak is using a gap strategy, and you can’t have the extracted element represented by a clitic inside the RC. No extracting A from PV.

(20b) *Né dengan saq=ne beli buku no

(21) *Né dengan saq beli=ne buku no

-(21b) is even worse than (20a). Again, these illustrate the gap strategy.

(21) *Né dengan saq beli=ne buku no

(22a) *Né dengan saq=ne beli buku no siq dengan no

-(22b) is “just bad. No compromise.” Adding *siq* dengan no makes it even worse. Again, this illustrates the gap strategy.

(22b) *Né dengan saq beli buku no siq dengan no

-this is bad because the A is present inside the RC with *siq dengan no*. But (20a) is OK. Again, this illustrates the gap strategy.

(23a) Né buku [saq dengan no beli]

(23b) Né buku saq=ne beli

‘This is the book that the guy bought’

‘This is the book that he bought’

-both (23a, b) are OK, Nisa says. This shows P extracting from both AV and PV, which is acceptable sometimes for Nisa.

(24) Né buku saq siq=ne beli

-(24) “is more common, more preferred than (23a). “We like that saq siq”, Nisa says. There is “no difference in meaning” between (23a) and (24), though, Nisa says. Nisa’s speaker doesn’t like (23a): “No native speaker would say it like that”. So there is inter-speaker variability in the acceptance of extracting P from AV.

(25) Né buku saq siq=ne beli siq dengan no

-(25) is “better than (23a) because of *siq*” but it is “equally good as (24) but (25) has more information”